

To: Maria Rea[Maria.Rea@noaa.gov]; Johnson, Kathleen[Johnson.Kathleen@epa.gov]; Goforth, Kathleen[Goforth.Kathleen@epa.gov]
Cc: Moon, Laura K.@DWR[Laura.K.Moon@water.ca.gov]; Jason R Phillips[JPhillips@usbr.gov]; Ryan Wulff[Ryan.Wulff@noaa.gov]; Michelle Banonis[mbanonis@usbr.gov]; Larry Rabin[larry_rabin@fws.gov]; David Murillo[dmurillo@usbr.gov]; Ren Lohofener[Ren_Lohofener@fws.gov]; Dan Castleberry[dan_castleberry@fws.gov]; Bonham, Chuck@Wildlife[Chuck.Bonham@wildlife.ca.gov]; Carl Wilcox[Carl.Wilcox@wildlife.ca.gov]; Mark Cowin[Mark.Cowin@water.ca.gov]; Blumenfeld, Jared[BLUMENFELD.JARED@EPA.GOV]
From: will.stelle@noaa.gov
Sent: Thur 9/4/2014 9:17:53 PM
Subject: EPA Meeting Next Week

Dear Kathleen J and Kathleen G: We (the core Federal BDCP team) have participate in some good and very useful discussions with the state over the last two days on BDCP related matters, including how to address the major EPA comments. All good. Obviously, there are strong views on the general topic, but I am confident that we can make good progress on them.

I would like to suggest some slight adjustments in Tuesday's meeting. Fundamentally, they reflect a perspective that this will be a working session where we delve into a discussion of your major comments so that we can begin to plumb how best to address them, or whether in fact some represent misunderstandings, or whatever. . . . Lets assume that all the participants have read the comments.

To foster this, I would suggest a more focused agenda that skips a generic presentation of the EPA comments and delves directly into a focused and organized discussion of the top tier topics. I do not think a general open Q and A framing is sufficiently organized. I would also not try to get into issues of the scope of the supplement yet, believing that we need to plough into the underpinnings of the major topics and discern where there is agreement, fundamental disagreements, differing understandings of the program itself or the current effects analyses and their implications.

Perhaps we can structure the agenda around headings of the major topics broached by the EPA letter. List those major topics, perhaps a half dozen at most, and then organize the discussion around each.

I would also recommend narrowing the range of invited entities to enable this deeper discussion to occur. NRCS? No. And whether we should fold in state board staff participation might be an open issue.

I'll visit with Maria tomorrow morning on this, and then we can either email some specific ideas or do a quick call. I would recommend that we loop in Laura King Moon from the state side in the discussion, and perhaps their ICF technical consultant lead too.

So, more tomorrow.

Lots of fun, and I hope we can make good progress next week.

Many thanks,

WS

William Stelle Jr.
Regional Administrator
West Coast Region
NOAA Fisheries
206-526-6150